CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
1516 NINTH STREET
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-5512
www.energy.ca.gov

October 13, 2005

To: Interested Parties

Subject: **RFQ 700-05-701** Peak Workload Support for the Energy Facilities Siting Program and for the Energy Planning Program, **Addendum #1**, including:

- Questions and Answers from Pre-Bid Conferences
- Pre-Bid Attendees, September 21, 22
- RFQ Requestors
- Past & Potential Future Planning Activities (Pre-Bid Handout)
- Current Siting Cases (Pre-Bid Handout)
- Pre-Bid Presentation Slides (Pre-Bid Handout)

Notice is hereby given that the above-named RFQ is amended as follows:

- Attachment 7, Exhibit E, Section 4, Sub-clause C is amended to read:

C. For the duration of this contract, the Contractor and its employees and subcontractors shall not work for anyone, and shall not negotiate or make arrangements concerning employment with anyone, who is seeking certification from the Commission, planning to file an application for certification, or otherwise working on an application for certification that has been filed or is expected to be filed at the Energy Commission. The Contractor shall inform its employees and subcontractors of this restriction and shall immediately inform the Commission's Contract Manager of any potential conflicts.

Except as herein amended in Addendum #1, all other terms and conditions of this RFQ remain the same.

Attached are Questions and Answers from the Pre-Bid conferences, as well as attendance lists of both conferences and handouts provided to attendees. A list of those who requested a copy of the RFQ has also been made available.

Statements of Qualifications are due no later than 5:00 p.m. on November 4th, 2005.

Justin Oakley
Contracts Officer

RFQ 700-05-701
Peak Workload Support for the Energy Facilities Siting
And Energy Planning Program
Questions & Answers:
From Pre-bid Conferences & Delivered Directly to Commission

October 14, 2005

Administrative Questions

Q-1: Is the Energy Commission meeting Minority / Women Business Enterprises (MWBE) requirements?

A-1: M/WBE requirements were removed from state contracting law in 1996.

Q-2: Will the Energy Commission pay for the out-of-state travel of a subcontractor that is located out-of-state to come to California?

A-2: Yes, the Energy Commission will pay for the out-of-state travel of a subcontractor that is located out-of-state. Although the Energy Commission recognizes that there are times when such action is needed, the expense involved, if done often, will be a factor to consider in negotiating cost.

Q-3: Can bidders submit example work products in either hardcopy or electronic form?

A-3: The Energy Commission encourages bidders to submit electronic copies of sample work products if available, but hard copies are acceptable.

Q-4: How will the Commission staff rank bidders in evaluating the proposals?

A-4: Bidders will be ranked separately for the siting and planning portions of the Statement of Qualifications (SOQ).

Q-5: Will the Commission staff have a joint discussion with a contractor on siting and planning if one contractor is proposing to do both and is selected among the top three competitors for both areas?

A-5: Under such a circumstance, the discussions would be separate meetings, although they could be held concurrently or combined into one discussion. .

Q-6: If one contractor proposes for both planning and siting, would the interview time be extended?

A-6: No. The one bidder would have the same amount of time for the planning discussion and siting discussion as other bidders. .

Q-7: What is your plan to transition from the existing contract to the new contract when a new contractor is selected?

A-7: Each incomplete task will be assessed for its potential to be completed by a new contractor. In the past we have transitioned by extending the existing contract to allow the incumbent contractor to finish out task(s) where it would be inefficient or infeasible for a new contractor to finish the work. It is anticipated that a similar approach will be used during the next transition.

Q-8: Who is the incumbent contractor?

A-8: Aspen Environmental Group is the existing contractor for the current three-year contract.

Q-9: Can you disclose the list of current subcontractors?

A-9: Yes. Following is a list of sub-contractors that have performed work on the current contract:

Akula Venkatram	909-787-2195	Kaku Associates	310-458-9916	PCR	310-451-4488
Altos Management Partners, Inc. (NG Modeling, Risk Assessment)	650-948-8830	KASL Consulting Engineers	916-722-1800	Peter Raimondi	831-459-5674
Arellano Associates	909-6272974	Kessler and Associates	530-644-2010	Philip Williams & Associates	415-262-2300
Arnold and Arnold, Inc.	619-233-1096	Larry L. Harrison, P.E.	925-753-5069	R.W. Beck	916-929-3653
Aspen Environmental Group	916-379-0350	Laura Frank Design	510-814-8184	Risk Science Associates	415-479-7560
BioTox Services	818-508-7746	LDBond & Associates	530-757-1500	RM Engineering	775-323-8488
Black Eagle Consulting, Inc.	775-359-6600	LMA Consulting	415-722-3717	Rumla, Inc.	925-938-2535
Brown-Buntin Associates, Inc.	916-961-5822	London Economics	617-494-8200	Scheuerman Consulting	916-630-7073
Chambers Group Inc.	949-261-5414	M. Cubed	530-757-6363	Sierra Energy & Risk Assessment	916-791-1212
Chappelle Energy Associates, Inc.	770-833-1215	Marine Research Specialists	805-289-3927	Statistical Research	90-335-1896
EDM Services, Inc.	805-527-3300	Marine Research Specialists	805-289-3927	Tenera Environmental	805-541-0310
Flagg Applied Research & Technology	530-941-7276	Metcalf & Eddy	619-233-7855	Utility System Efficiencies, Inc.	916-487-6870
Gabriel Roche, Inc.	510-527-6615	Michael Clayton & Associates	503-439-8036	Utility System Efficiencies, Inc.	916-359-3986
Gas Technology Institute	847-768-0512	Mike Foster	831-771-4435	Veneklasen Associates	310-450-1733
Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.	415-565-7366	MRW & Associates	510-834-1999	Wetlands Research Associates, Inc.	415-454-8868
Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.	714-547-5413	Myra L. Frank Associates, Inc.	213-627-5376	William Kanemoto & Associates	510-655-9585
Granite Financial Solutions, Inc.	916-735-3554	Navigant Consulting, Inc.	818-662-5720	Zaininger Engineering Co.	916-789-7120
Gregor Cailliet	831-771-4432	Pacific Group Electric Power	949-713-9835	Stephen Derby	650-814-6141
Henwood Energy Services, Inc.	916-569-0985	Pacific Municipal Consultants	916-361-8384	Kevin Grow	916-362-8962
HG Consulting Group, Inc.	916-492-1343	PAR Environmental Services	916-739-8356	William McCroskey	714-596-4633
Joe Donaldson	805-545-8511				

Q-10: The current 3-year contract ceiling is $20 million. How much of that was allocated to be spent each year?

A-10: $14.9 million was allocated to the contract over the 3-year period. $8.2 million in work authorizations has been approved to date. An additional $0.2 million in work authorizations is being proposed.

Q-11: During negotiations, do you require cost expressed in terms of overhead multipliers similar to federal government requirements?

A-11: No. A single ‘‘loaded’’ (or billable) hourly rate for each employee position and subcontractor employee position is negotiated.

Q-12: The sample Work Authorization in Attachment 1 refers to salaries and rates of pay (paragraph 5A). We consider rates of pay, as opposed to billing rates, to be confidential. Will the CEC be willing to negotiate costs on a basis only of billing rates?

A-12: Yes, the Energy Commission negotiates costs based on the “fully loaded” hourly rates that the proposed contractor intends on billing the Energy Commission for services. However, the contract is written with a detailed budget, including the basis for the billing rate (“unloaded” rate), which usually includes a breakdown of the components of the billing rate (percentage of the billing rate for direct labor, fringe benefits, general & administrative, profit, etc.) The Energy Commission does not keep confidential contract budgets, including the detailed budget breakdown. This same budget information is included in work authorizations, and the Energy Commission does not keep confidential work authorization budgets.

Q-13: How many copies of the proposal need to be turned in to the Energy Commission?

A-13: The RFQ calls for one (1) original and six (6) copies.

Q-14: What is the street address of the Energy Commission in Sacramento to which the SOQ should be sent?

A-14: Justin Oakley
Contracts Office
1516 9th Street, MS-18,
Sacramento, CA 95814

Q-15: Has the Energy Commission met its Small Business participation requirements as established by Executive Order D-37-01?

A-15: Yes. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005, the Energy Commission achieved Small Business participation for goods and services of 46.5% and 64.8%, respectively. This exceeds the 25% goal established by Executive Order D-37-01.

Q-16: Will there be a list of firms and consultants that are interested in this RFQ posted on the Energy Commission website, or otherwise published, with their area of specialty to make it easier to find potential sub-consultants or firms?

A-16: Lists of firms and consultants that requested a copy of the RFQ and/or attended either of the pre-bid conferences will be made available on the Energy Commission website. Their areas of specialty, however, will not be included.

Q-17: Will the Energy Commission staff, in going through the discussion phase with the top three bidders, eliminate the preliminary scores and just start fresh in evaluating the top bidders?

A-17: No. The Energy Commission staff will have the discussions, re-evaluate the preliminary scores and make adjustments, where justified, in preparing the final scores.

Q-18: What is the level of DVBE expenditures expressed as a percentage of total expenditures for the current contract?

A-18: Approximately 5.5%

Q-19: Please provide relevant expense policies, if any, and indicate the extent to which they may be negotiated.

A-19: Relevant expense policies are located on the internet at: http://www.energy.ca.gov/contracts/2003-03-05_TRAVEL_PER_DIEM.PDF. They are not negotiable.

Q-20: What Energy Commission staff members will be scoring the SOQ, and who will likely participate in the discussions?

A-20: Scoring sheets become public after the Notice of Selection is posted. The names of the scorers are included on the scoring sheets. Copies of the scoring sheets will be available on request after the Notice of Selection is posted. Please contact Justin Oakley in the Energy Commission Contracts Office to request copies.

Technical Questions

Q-21: You gave an indication of a dollar range of monthly consultant invoices that you have experienced under the existing peak workload contract. Can you give an idea of the range for the number of contractor staff required during the current contract?

A-21: Following is a list, by month, of the number of sub-consultant companies (each with one or more employees dedicated) working under the peak workload contract from October of 2003 to August of 2005. In addition, the prime contractor, Aspen Environmental, also provided administrative and management support staffing:

Year	2003	2004	2005
Month			
January		11	19
February		10	15
March		10	15
April		12	20
May		12	22
June		14	21
July		15	18
August		14	
September		17	
October	5	19	
November	6	15	
December	8	-	

In the planning area, we have a 2-year policy planning cycle which we are now just completing for the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report. The scope of the issues identified and the order in which they will be addressed define the timing and magnitude of our staff analysis workload and the need for contract support in the areas of electricity and natural gas supply forecasting, transmission system planning, and the environmental performance trends of electricity generation. Typically our use of contractors for policy work is low at the beginning of the 2-year cycle and increases progressively to a high point in the last six months of the cycle, as indicated in the data above, depending on siting case workload and the need for special expertise. Virtually all our policy work has been completed for the 2005 Energy Policy Report.

In the siting area, our use of contract staff will depend on the number of applications that we receive in any given time frame, and the level of staff commitments to policy work. The Commission has a standard twelve-month licensing process that requires staff analyses and participation on a certain schedule. Currently we have only five active siting cases and use a baseline of from five to eight consultant staff. During the energy crisis from 2001 to 2003, there were times when we had eight new applications every month, and we used hundreds of contract staff. We have been expecting more power plant applications during 2006 as a result of the investor-owned utility Request for Offer (RFO) processes being carried out by PG&E, Edison and San Diego Gas & Electric. However, Edison recently cancelled their RFO process, creating more uncertainty for our forecast of expected applications.

Q-22: Has the Energy Commission had previous peak workload support contracts that solicit support in both planning and siting?

A-22: Yes, the contract we currently have in place does provide support for both planning and siting work. What's new in this RFQ is the way we've structured it to allow for separate competition for the award of the planning and siting support work.

Q-23: What are some of the new areas that the Commission staff might be doing more work on in the future?

A-23: The Energy Commission's analysis of electricity and related issues is continuing to expand, including out-of-state generation and transmission issues, cross-border issues with Mexico, global climate change, electricity market issues, transmission planning, and transmission corridor designation. Please refer to the handout provided at the pre-bid conference, entitled "Past and Potential Future CEC Staff Energy Planning Analysis Topics", and to the Energy Commission's website at for information regarding issues addressed in the policy report process: http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005_energypolicy/index.html. Although most new areas of work tend to emerge from the policy report process and then are addressed through planning work, the siting cases occasionally present new technical issues also.

Q-24: The RFQ mentions an approximate two-to-one split between siting and planning expected under the new contract. Was there a similar split in the previous contracts?

A-24: Yes. Given what has happened since the beginning of the current contract and not knowing what our specific expectations will be a year or two years from now, the two-to-one split is a good baseline to work from. It should be noted, though, that more planning work was done in the current contract than in the prior contract , and that the ratio of funds expended between planning and siting in the current contract is closer to one-to-one.

Q-25: Are there specific analytical tools (models) the Commission staff uses that a contractor should be prepared to use?

A-25: Yes. Following is a description of the modeling tools used in our electricity supply assessment, transmission planning, natural gas supply assessment, and power plant application analysis that a successful bidder will need to demonstrate the ability to use. The contractor may be expected to prepare model input data, process the model output data and interpret the results. The contractor should be prepared to obtain a license for use of individual models if they are required.

MODELS USED FOR ENERGY COMMISSION STAFF PLANNING AND SITING WORK

Electricity and Transmission Resource Planning Studies

The Energy Commission staff use a number of models for conducting electricity planning and system reliability studies. The following is a general description of the tools currently used by staff for any upcoming studies identified for the 2007 Integrated Energy Policy Report.

Locational marginal pricing or nodal production cost simulation models like GE MAPS, GE PSLF, Power World and MarketSym: These are all models that have been used or are being used by staff. MarketSym is developed and licensed by Global Energy Decisions. A contractor must have a working knowledge of all these tools and the input databases to assist the Energy Commission on analytical tasks.

1. MarketSym is the primary tool used to simulate generation throughout the Western Electricity Coordinating Council regions. The model has been used by the Energy Commission staff over the last 5 years.
    a. MarketSym will be used for a number of electricity generation analytical tasks for the upcoming IEPR (utility natural gas demand for generation forecasts, evaluating resource development scenarios, market clearing price forecasts, etc.). Decisions on the analytical tasks still need to be made for work commitments over the next several years.
    b. MarketSym linked with PowerWorld is a locational marginal pricing (LMP) market simulation tool critical for upcoming Energy Commission transmission studies.
    c. The tools will also be used for different Public Interest Energy Research studies, such as to evaluate the distribution level benefits of DG compared to conventional central station facilities or system reliability implications of increasing the use of intermittent resources.
    d. Staff also uses GE PSLF as its transmission power flow model and has used GE MAPS in the past for transmission project studies.
2. The MarketSym license includes a basic database that characterizes each generation facility in the west, compiled demand forecasts and fuel prices.
    a. The Energy Commission modifies the database using in-house forecasts, public data and information from data requests that may remain confidential.
    b. The Global Energy Decisions database is a proprietary product and will require a contractor to sign a non-disclosure agreement.
    c. A contractor will also need to sign a non-disclosure agreement with the Energy Commission since some of the updates use confidential information that is submitted under regulatory requirements or subpoenas.
3. Some contractor tasks will require using the MarketSym Zonal, MarketSym LMP datasets, while other tasks may simply need a contractor who can understand the general data topology and provide assistance in developing dataset inputs.

4. The Energy Commission may require a contractor to use the Marketsym model to prepare probabilistic risk studies. The contractor will need to understand how to run a stochastic simulation.
5. A contractor will need to arrange for licensing and use of MarketSym and MarketSym LMP for Energy Commission related tasks.

Levelized Cost of Generation: The Levelized Cost of Generation Model is a public spreadsheet model that was developed under contract for Energy Commission analytical tasks for the 2003 Integrated Energy Policy Report. A contractor is currently working with staff to enhance the functionality of the model and update the database input assumptions. This tool will be used for upcoming Energy Commission program studies and current CPUC proceedings (setting QF payments and Market Referent Price for renewable solicitations).

1. The Levelized Cost of Generation Model is a spreadsheet model that calculates the levelized cost for various technologies. These Levelized Costs provide a mechanism to compare the cost of one power plant to another – the object being that the power plant with the lower Levelized Cost is more economical, and therefore the most desirable generation addition.
2. The Cost of Generation model will compute costs based on both revenue requirements (the current mode) and cash-flow bases. Expected revenues and expenses will be reported on a year-by-year basis as well as levelized revenue requirements.
3. The model will also be able to develop a series of first-year costs, in order to reflect the estimated cost of a new market entrant, which is valuable for Market Price Forecasting.
4. Additional tasks involve updating the related economic variables for estimating levelized costs for other commercial and emerging generation technologies.
5. Any market participant can have access to this model, but it does require a fundamental understanding of engineering and financing characteristics of the generation technologies.
6. The user selects the technology type and key data within the model describing the technology, such as start date, fuel used, cost of fuel, ownership, geographical location, and various general assumptions. The model then calculates the individual components in $/kW-Yr. The individual component costs are combined into Fixed and Variable Costs, and these values are converted to $/MWh.

Supply Adequacy Model (**SAM):** The Supply Adequacy Model was developed by Energy Commission staff, with the assistance of contracted programmers. This tool is a public domain model, available upon request. The input dataset may contain confidential information and require non-disclosure agreements.

1. SAM is currently used by WECC members to conduct an electricity supply scenario assessment for different regions in the west.
2. SAM is currently used for Energy Commission probability studies to:
    a. Evaluate the probability of occurrence for many, different system conditions
    b. The cumulative probability of these conditions occurring simultaneously
    c. Probability implications of meeting different operating reserve margins
3. Energy Commission staff will be compiling statistical information of a number of potential adverse condition factors that may affect operating reserve margins.

Natural Gas Supply Assessment

The North American Region Gas (NARG) model: Since 1989, the California Energy Commission has used the North American Regional Gas (NARG) model, its principal assessment tool, to forecast natural gas prices and supplies. This generalized equilibrium model solves for supply, demand, and price equilibrium for a user-specified number of supply and demand regions over a 45-year time horizon. A series of pipeline corridors connect supply regions to demand regions, creating an integrated natural gas infrastructure across North America. However, to accommodate the model's functions and simulate the natural gas market, the model's topology has been divided into three (3) super-regions: the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Each super-region contains various regions which further breaks into sub-regions.

Resources: The model contains 42 supply regions. Within each supply sub-region are multiple resources, reflecting different types of conventional and unconventional resource formations. Resources fall into two reserve categories: proven (already found) and potential (yet to be found). Quantities are assigned to each proven and potential resource type as are operation and maintenance (O&M) costs. Exploration, drilling and development cost are determined for potential resources.

LNG: Legacy and new LNG facilities have been included in the model. These are allowed to expand as the market will allow. Costs associated with LNG include the original commodity costs, liquification, shipping and receiving and gasification.

Demand Centers: There are 36 demand sub-regions in the model. Sectorial demand includes residential, commercial, industrial (chemical), and industrial (non-chemical). These may be either elastic or inelastic to price. The power generation remains inelastic. The U.S. demand regions largely correspond with U.S. census regions.

Pipelines: The transportation nodes—pipelines or pipeline corridors—link supply regions to demand regions. For each transportation node, a profile, which comprises pipeline capacity, transportation rates (tariff), and expansion criteria are prepared. For each pipeline or pipeline corridor transport capacity and costs are allowed to vary with use and/or new pipeline infrastructure. When economically feasible, the model is permitted to add capacity to an existing corridor. For example, when natural gas flows exceed the listed capacity, the model applies an associated cost to the transportation tariff to account for expenditure of expanding the pipeline capacity.

Air Quality Models used in the Energy Commission's Siting Program

The Energy Commission staff uses the following U. S. EPA recommended air dispersion models in the analysis of power plant applications:

Screening Level models:

- SCREEN3
- CTSCREEN

Non-screening models:

- CALPUFF – Used predominately for long range transport assessment necessary for Federal Prevention of Significant Deterioration Class 1 modeling.

- CTDMPLUS - Complex terrain model that uses actual hourly meteorological data when ISCST3 model overpredicts impacts.

- ISCST3 - Most common model used for near-field impacts, especially for sources located in flat-terrain sites.

- OCD - Used to predict impacts from sources close to a large water body.

Although not an EPA approved model, AERMOD can be used on a case-by-case basis. It is especially useful for complex terrain situations.

For cooling tower and/or stack vapor plume dimension and frequency prediction, the Combustion Source Vapor Plume Model is used.

Water / Waste Water Models Used in the Energy Commission's Siting Program

GT Pro, Steam Pro, GT Master, and Steam Master Software (Thermoflow, Inc.) or equivalent are used for analysis of system design and operating characteristics of power plant projects submitted to the Commission's siting program. While most power plants are designed thermodynamically by equipment manufacturers using proprietary programs, these programs are typically used during the preliminary phase of work, or for sensitivity analysis considering change of design criteria. A Contractor should be able to perform and provide analysis of proposed power plant projects using these programs or equivalent as necessary during the siting process.

1. GT Pro and Steam Pro are design programs that create heat balances and produce a physical design for the power plant.
    a. GT Pro is effective for creating or analyzing plant designs and determining optimal configuration and design parameters. Inputs are design criteria and assumptions that the program uses to compute heat and mass balance, system performance, and component sizing, while Steam Pro performs the same functions for steam plants.
2. GT Master and STEAM Master are simulation programs that predict the performance of the plant resulting from its equipment, control points, loads, and ambient operating conditions. Typically, GT Master and Steam Master provide predictive design simulation of HRSG, steam turbine, condenser cooling towers of GT based cogeneration and combined cycle plants, and comparable simulation for steam plants, respectively.
3. In the case of combined cycle plants, heat balance diagrams for gas turbine based cogeneration and combined cycle plants and hardware design are used by staff to verify thermodynamic input that can be used for economic analysis and feasibility studies. The same requirements would be needed for steam plants.
    a. These simulation models may also be useful for research related activities at the Commission.

FEMFLOW3D (Durbin and Bond, 1997) is a finite-element computer program that simulates three-dimensional ground-water systems. The program was developed particularly to simulate regional ground-water systems, but it can also be applied to smaller-scale problems, such as well interference. The program can be used to simulate both confined and water-table aquifers.

1. The finite element method provides flexibility in the design of the geometric grid that represents the physical dimensions of the aquifer system.
    a. For example, features that can be well represented with a finite-element grid include irregular, random geographic and geologic features, irregular boundaries, and increased detail in localized areas of particular interest within the study area.

2. Hydrologic features that can be represented include stream-aquifer interactions, phreatophytic evapotranspiration, highly permeable fault zones, land subsidence, and land-aquifer interactions associated with land-use activities. The program can also represent the primary features associated with complex irrigation systems, such as irrigated agriculture, and can calculate the groundwater recharge that results from these activities.
3. Three boundary conditions, including specified-head boundaries, specified-flux boundaries, and variable-flux boundaries, can be represented with the program.
4. The program also provides a method for identifying aquifer and river-bed parameters that can be used in the calibration of models.
5. FEMFLOW3D was used to develop the groundwater model for the High Desert Power Project (HDPP model). The HDPP model is used to calculate the amount of banked groundwater available to the project for backup water. HDPP's primary water supply is subject to short-term operational outages and potential long-term outages during drought.
6. FEMFLOW3D has also been used to evaluate the aquifer tests, which are used to calculate the transmissivity and storage parameters of aquifers. Aquifer testing has been required for the High Desert Power Project, Blythe Energy Project I, Three Mountain Power Project and Mountain View Power Project.

The modular finite-difference ground-water flow model **(MODFLOW)** developed by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) is a computer program for simulating common features in ground-water systems (McDonald and Harbaugh, 1988; Harbaugh and McDonald, 1996). The program was constructed in the early 1980's and has continually evolved since then with development of many new packages and related programs for ground-water studies. Currently, **MODFLOW** is the most widely used program in the world for simulating ground-water flow.

1. MODFLOW is designed to simulate aquifer systems in which (1) saturated-flow conditions exist, (2) Darcy's Law applies, (3) the density of ground water is constant, and (4) the principal directions of horizontal hydraulic conductivity or transmissivity do not vary within the system.
2. These conditions are met for many aquifer systems for which there is an interest in analysis of ground-water flow and contaminant movement.
    a. For these systems, MODFLOW can simulate a wide variety of hydrologic features and processes.
    b. Steady-state and transient flow can be simulated in unconfined aquifers, confined aquifers, and confining units.
    c. A variety of features and processes such as rivers, streams, drains, springs, reservoirs, wells, evapotranspiration, and recharge from precipitation and irrigation also can be simulated.
3. The aquifer parameters and geometry of the High Desert Power Plant (HDPP) Model developed during the HDPP certification process were based on a preliminary version of a groundwater model of the Mojave River Basin, developed by the USGS using MODFLOW.
    a. The CEC Staff was required to "revise the HDPP model…to incorporate the gradational changes in the hydraulic conductivity of the Regional Aquifer represented in the USGS Mojave River Groundwater Basin model."
4. Because MODFLOW is so widely used for the evaluation of groundwater issues, it is likely to be the basis of existing groundwater studies and is likely to be used by applicants to analyze groundwater-use impacts for future power projects.

GMS (Groundwater Modeling System) is a graphical groundwater modeling support program. It provides support for the MODFLOW and can be used to configure files and plot data for FEMFLOW3D, as well as other groundwater modeling programs such as the MODPATH 3D (particle tracking),

MT3DMS 3D (multi-species contaminant transport), the RT3D 3D (bioremediation transport), SEAM3D 3D (bioremediation transport), SEEP2D, and FEMWATER 3D.

1. GMS is used to display a defined groundwater model in either plan view or 3D oblique view, which can be rotated interactively.
2. It provides tools for site characterization, model conceptualization, mesh and grid generation, geostatistics, and output post-processing.
    a. Cross-sections and fence diagrams may be cut anywhere in the model. Hidden surface removal, and color and light source shading can be used to generate highly photo-realistic rendered images.
    b. Contours, color fringes, and 3D iso-surfaces can be used to display the variation of input data or computed results.
3. GMS has been used to evaluate the groundwater models submitted for Compliance by the High Desert Power Plant.
    a. It was also used to extract information from the USGS Mojave Groundwater Basin Model, which was used as a primary reference in the development of the final HDPP approved by compliance for this project. It can be used to assess the validity and accuracy of a wide range of groundwater models, including well interference models.

Q-26: What kind of work products would be needed under the proposed peak workload contract and what kinds of written products should bidders provide as examples of such work?

A-26: It depends on whether the work would be planning or siting. As can be seen on the Energy Commission's web site (http://www.energy.ca.gov/2005_energypolicy/index.html), the planning work products provided to support the Energy Commission's energy policy program vary widely from electricity and natural gas supply forecasting to transmission planning, environmental performance trends, and special issues such as water-energy relationships and global climate change. Work products in the siting program usually consist of technical sections of Preliminary or Final Staff Assessments (PSA or FSA) of energy facility Applications for Certification. Examples can be viewed on the Energy Commission's website at http://www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/alphabetical.html. To demonstrate their ability to produce such products, bidders should submit copies of work products that involve similar skills and expertise in preparation, such as environmental reports, planning assessments, special issue analyses, or permitting applications for or analyses of natural resource, energy or industrial projects.

Q-27: What has the historical workload distribution in the siting program been between licensing and compliance activities?

A-27: Most of the workload has been in the licensing phase. The licensing phase is where the technical staff, covering about twenty to twenty-three different disciplines, is providing an analysis of the proposed projects. The analytical activity in the compliance phase can be somewhat reduced; it consists primarily of tracking the status of compliance with licensing conditions that are adopted in the Energy Commission Decision on a project.

Q-28: Does the Energy Commission expect under the proposed contract to use the contractor to manage and carry out the entire analysis of individual siting projects?

A-28: Depending on the number of applications we receive and how closely they come in together, up to a certain point we will integrate the consultant staff with our existing in-house staff where needed. If we receive or expect to receive a very high number of applications over a short time period, we may have a Commission staff project manager work with a contractor on an entire project with a team of consultants. However, our preference is to integrate the consultant staff in with our in-house team, because the communication and coordination is generally easier.

Q-29: Will the Commission staff in its planning work be addressing electricity supply reliability issues?

A-29: Yes we will, both in terms of the reliability of the transmission system as well as the reliability of the generation system.

Q-30: Other than Aspen, what other master contractors has the Energy Commission used in its past peak workload contracts?

A-30: Previous contractors include Envirosphere and URS.

Q-31: Is URS still active?

A-31: They are still active but not in providing support to the Energy Commission staff's siting and planning work. They have been involved in work in support of power plant applications.

Q-32: Are Aspen and URS eligible to compete for the siting and planning contracts under the current RFQ?

A-32: Yes they are. Aspen, the incumbent contractor, is eligible to bid on both contracts. URS seems to have taken on work in the recent past that involves preparing Applications For Certification for power plant proponents. Nevertheless, they would still be eligible to compete for the planning contract.

Q-33: What percentage of work in any given year was done by your own staff, and what percentage of the work was done by the peak workload contractors?

A-33: The amount of contract work has varied from year to year based on the workload and the specialized expertise that we have needed to supplement our staff expertise in both siting and planning.

Q-34: How many small cogeneration projects (less than 50 MW) are being constructed in California?

A-34: We don't track the number of projects that are licensed by local governments and therefore not subject to our jurisdiction.

Q-35: How much of the work under the current contract is being done by the prime contractor verses the sub-consultants?

A-35: We don't have that data currently available.

Q-36: What is the Energy Commission's three-year workload projection for the proposed contracts?

A-36: We don't have a specific workload projection for the proposed contracts because we don't know what power plant applications will be filed, or what the ultimate scope of policy work will be over that time period. Although the investor-owned utilities' current Request for Offer

processes may result in power plants being proposed for licensing, the only information we have on expected siting projects we have provided to you in the handout titled “Energy Facility Status,” which can be viewed on the CEC website at www.energy.ca.gov/sitingcases/all_projects.html

Q-37: It is our understanding that any computer models used to support showings to the CPUC must be made available to interveners under "AB 475" rules. (AB 475 was the 1985 bill that enacted Public Utilities Code section 1822.) Do similar rules apply to software used to support CEC analyses that may be part of open CEC proceedings (e.g., the IEPR)?

A-37: Public Utilities Code section 1822 merely provides an option for the CPUC to avoid re-litigation of issues associated with certain models used in energy planning proceedings when the Energy Commission has offered an opportunity for cross examination of testimony regarding those models in its proceedings.

Q-38: Are welding, metallurgical or materials engineering disciplines anticipated as support for the siting program?

A-38: No. Facility design addresses the appropriate design criteria/codes to use in design. The design is done after certification and reviewed by the Chief Building Official delegate agents.

Q-39: To what degree has the Commission staff focused its use of consulting support on policy and planning work in the areas of Electricity Planning, Gas Planning, Transmission System Planning and siting Policy and Trends (environmental)?

A-39: In the 2005 Integrated Energy Policy Report process which has just concluded, the staff generally used consulting support equally in all of the areas.

Q-40: What is the platform and means by which data has been collected in the past; is it the intent of the Commission staff to continue with the existing process; and will the contractors be responsible for data collection and management?

A-40: Staff has and plans to continue to collect data from electric and gas utilities, electricity generators, and local, state and federal agencies, research institutions and other organizations.

Although contractors may be used in some cases to help in the collection, processing and management of data, they will not have primary responsibility for data collection and management.

Q-41: Will the Commission staff reserve the right to direct the prime contractor (either for siting or planning) to augment the team - including the addition of staff-identified subcontractors - during the period of performance, to cover any identified shortcomings or new technical needs?

A-41: Yes.

Q-42: For each work authorization, what is the process by which the prime contractor and the Commission staff agree on the scope of work and level of effort or budget, and how large an area is covered by each work authorization?

A-42: The Commission staff is responsible for identifying the scope, content, products and schedule of a proposed work authorization. The prime contractor prepares a draft work authorization and a proposed budget, which is reviewed by staff and modified accordingly before the work authorization is finalized. The scope and size of planning work authorizations varies widely depending on the complexity of the issues addressed. Work authorizations on siting cases may also be large if the projects are complex and controversial.

Legal Questions

Q-43: If a company has worked with a developer that has an Application for Certification (AFC) before the Energy Commission, but it didn't work specifically on that AFC - it just worked with the developer in the past in other areas - does that preclude the company from actually working on that AFC?

A-43: A company would be eligible to enter into a contract for siting work so long as the company is not currently working for the developer that has an AFC before the Energy Commission (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.) Once the contract was executed, the company may be assigned to work on that developer's AFC, as long as the contractor's work for the developer ended more than 12 months prior to the contractor's

work on the developer's AFC pursuant to the contract with the Energy Commission. Also, the company could be assigned to work on that particular AFC as long as the company did not work on that AFC when the company worked for the developer. (See the availability rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, 33-34, and Attachment 7, page 23.)

Q-44: If a Contractor has assisted SCE or PG&E with reviews of projects solicited under their Request for Offers, but was not involved with the companies that submitted project proposals, may a Contractor then assist with reviews of any of these projects that are then the subject of an Application for Certification (AFC) before the Commission? Does it matter if the Contractor is still working for SCE or PG&E at the time Contractor would work with the Commission?

Q-44a: If a Contractor is working with PG&E and/or SCE to prepare a "short list" from their Request for Offers for generation resources, does that pose any conflict of interest if they're not working in any way with the firms that are competing in the RFO?

A-44: The answer depends on the circumstances. Assume, for example, that the Contractor assisted SCE in reviewing proposals, and there were three winning proposals. The 3 developers that submitted the proposals to SCE then submit Applications for Certification (AFC) to the Energy Commission for three separate power plants.

1) First, we ask if the Contractor is eligible to enter into a contract for siting work. The answer is yes, so long as the contractor is not currently working for any of the developers who submitted an AFC to the Energy Commission. See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23;

2) Second, we ask if the Contractor is available to perform certain siting work assignments. See the availability rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, 33-34, and Attachment 7, page 23. If the Contractor continued to work for SCE, the Contractor would not be assigned to review any of the three AFCs resulting from SCE's RFO. If the Contractor discontinued working for SCE, the Contractor could be assigned to review any of the three AFCs, but only after 12 months had passed between the time the Contractor discontinued working for SCE, and the time the Contractor was assigned to work on one of the AFCs.

Q-45: If a proposed contractor was working for an LNG proponent on a project in Massachusetts, and the LNG proponent proposes to put an LNG facility in California, would that be a conflict of interest for siting?

A-45: For purposes of answering this question, we assume that the project proponent will submit an Application for Certification (AFC) for a project that is under the Energy Commission's jurisdiction. If the proposed contractor is currently working for a developer on a project in another state, and the developer submits an AFC for a project in California, then the proposed contractor would not be eligible to enter into a contract with the Energy Commission for the siting work. The reason is that the proposed contractor would be working for a developer submitting a project before the Energy Commission, and working for the Energy Commission at the same time. (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.)

Q-46: Would working out-of-state for a power plant owner dealing with a joint venture (for example, PG&E) present a conflict?

A-46: If a contractor was working for a power plant owner (in the state of California, or outside of the state of California), and the power plant owner had submitted an Application for Certification that is pending before the Energy Commission, or planned to submit an AFC, then the contractor would not be eligible to enter into a contract with the Energy Commission for siting work. (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.)

Q-47. Bidder currently has a contract to provide services for power plant developer XYZ Company. XYZ Company currently has an application for certification (AFC) for a power plant before the Energy Commission, or, XYZ Company is planning on filing an AFC in the future. Would bidder's contract with XYZ Company disqualify bidder from working with the Energy Commission on the siting contract? In other words, is bidder disqualified from entering into the siting contract with the Energy Commission if bidder works for any developer or other entity that is seeking or may seek an AFC before the Energy Commission?

A-47: Yes, bidder would be disqualified from executing a contract with the Energy Commission on siting work, if bidder currently has a contract with a developer who is or may file an AFC

before the Energy Commission. (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.).

Q-48. Based on the facts in question #48, is bidder disqualified from working with the Energy Commission only on those AFCs for which bidder is working for a developer or other entity that is seeking or may seek an AFC before the Energy Commission?

A-48: No. As stated in the answer to #1, bidder is disqualified from contracting with the Energy Commission if bidder has a contract with a developer who is or may file an AFC before the Energy Commission.

Q-49: Bidder is currently working with a developer to license a power plant. Bidder understands that it would definitely be excluded from any work relating to this specific siting & licensing issue, but could the bidder work with Developer on other siting projects during the contract term?

A-49: No. Bidder may not execute a contract with the Energy Commission for siting work, if bidder has a contract with a developer who has an AFC before the Energy Commission or is planning to submit an AFC to the Energy Commission. (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.)

Q-50: Is bidder prohibited from working with a Developer on siting/licensing projects for future power projects while under contract with the Energy Commission?

A-50: Yes. If bidder is awarded a contract for the siting work, for the duration of bidder's contract with the Energy Commission, bidder would not be able to work for a developer that is preparing for a future AFC to be submitted to the Energy Commission.

Q-51: A potential bidder is presently providing Owner's Engineering Services to the following Utilities: SMUD and MID.

For SMUD, the potential bidder is providing Owner's Engineering Services for the CPP Project (located in South Sacramento). Services are expected to be complete November 2005. Services

include field engineering, engineering review support, specialty inspections, and environmental compliance inspections on behalf of the Owner (SMUD).

For MID, the potential bidder is providing Construction Management Services for the Modesto Energy Generation Station (MEGS formally called Ripon Peaker). This work will be completed in March 2006.

Beyond the projects listed above, the potential bidder is not involved in any other projects that are currently considered or planning to go to the CEC for approval. The potential bidder does plan, however, to provide continued Owner's Engineering Services for power plants that are in operation for both MID and SMUD.

The potential bidder would like to know if its support on these projects (or clients) will preclude it from bidding on the CEC Engineering and Environmental Technical Assistance RFQ for both the "siting" and "planning" scopes of work.

A-51: The potential bidder is eligible to submit a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) for the planning work, and if selected, execute a contract with the Energy Commission for the planning work. However, the potential bidder is not eligible to execute a contract with the Energy Commission for the siting work. The potential bidder is currently working for SMUD and the potential bidder will continue to work for SMUD, even after services on the CPP Project are complete in November 2005. Attachment 2 in the RFQ lists projects that are currently under review by the Energy Commission. Attachment 2 also lists projects that have been announced, and SMUD has announced a project that is expected to be reviewed during the term of the contract with the Energy Commission (three years.) Since the potential bidder will continue to work for SMUD during the term of the contract with the Energy Commission, the potential bidder is not eligible to execute a contract with the Energy Commission for the siting work. Please see the eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.

Q-52: If a Contractor has worked in the past with a developer who is seeking certification from the Commission, but the Contractor did not work on the project that the developer is seeking certification for, is it acceptable for the Contractor to assist the Commission with this developer's application?

A-52: A contractor would be eligible to enter into a contract for siting work so long as the contractor is not currently working for the developer who submitted an Application for Certification (AFC) before the Energy Commission. (See eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.) Once the contract was executed, the contractor may be assigned to work on that developer's AFC, as long as the contractor's work for the developer ended more than 12 months prior to contractor's work on developer's AFC pursuant to the contract with the Energy Commission. Also, the contractor may be assigned to work on that developer's AFC, as long as the contractor did not previously work on the AFC for the developer. (See the availability rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, 33-34, and Attachment 7, page 23.)

Q-53: If a firm has a contract with or is awarded a contract with a company that submits an Application for Certification (AFC) to the Energy Commission, but the firm is not providing professional services (engineering, procurement, construction or construction management) with regard to either the permitting or the facility proposed in the AFC, would it represent a conflict of interest for the firm to perform work for that company?

A-53: There is no conflict of interest for the planning work, and the firm is eligible to submit an SOQ for the planning work, and if selected, execute a contract with the Energy Commission for the planning work. However, for the siting work, the firm is not eligible to execute a contract with the Energy Commission if the firm is currently working for a company that has submitted a pending AFC or will submit an AFC to the Energy Commission, even though the firm is not providing professional services to the applicant related to the AFC. The firm's contract with the company that has an AFC before the Energy Commission would preclude the firm from executing a contract with the Energy Commission for the siting work. Please see the eligibility rule in the RFQ, pages 5, 9, and Attachment 7, page 23.

Q-54: We are in the process of putting a team together for the Peak Workload Support contract. We have included a specialist on our team who used to work at the Energy Commission. The person who we have identified retired from the California Energy Commission March 2005. By the time a winning team is selected and under contract (#700-05-701), this specialist will have been retired from the California Energy Commission for 12.5 to 13 months. This specialist did

not work on any aspects of this new solicitation (scoping the RFQ, preparing the RFQ, reviewing, scheduling). Are there any restrictions on including this person on our team?

A-54: No. There are no restrictions or prohibitions against including on your team a specialist who did not work on any aspect of this RFQ, and who left state service more than 12 months ago.

Q-55: Is issuing an RFQ and negotiating with the best qualified firm the only method used to hire technical specialists to assist the Energy Commission with its siting activities? If not, what are the other methods?

A-55: Yes. California law provides that the RFQ and cost negotiation process must be used to obtain the type of services the Energy Commission needs.

Q-56: The RFQ package includes contract terms in Attachment 7 but they are characterized on p. 13 as a "sample". Should our proposal be chosen we would want to negotiation certain modifications or extensions to those terms. Will that be part of cost negotiations? Should any exceptions to the term be noted in the response, and if so, where?

A-56: The contract terms in Attachment 7 are not negotiable. The contract terms are characterized as a sample, because there is some amount of customizing to fit the contract to the terms. For example, the Energy Commission must choose certain payment terms in Exhibit B (budget) such as the billing period, and must fill in subcontractors in Exhibit D (special terms). Other than this type of information added to the terms, the terms are not open for negotiation with contractors.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
PRE-BID CONFERENCE – Diamond Bar

RFQ: 700-05-701
September 22, 2005

VOLUNTARY SIGN-IN: You are not required to sign this sheet or provide any information as a condition for attending or participating in this meeting. However, if you want to receive notices of future meetings on today's topics, or be identified as a small or disabled veteran owned business, please write your name and address in the spaces below. A copy of this list is mailed with the questions and answer sets to all those who requested a copy of this RFQ.

HHPlease use black ink onlyHH

NAME AND COMPANY	PHYSICAL ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER and E-MAIL ADDRESS	SMALL OR DISABLED VETERAN OWNED BUSINESS
Rami Nassar ARUP	2440 S. Sepulveda Blvd # 180 Los Angeles, CA 90064	310-312-4661 rami.nassar@arup.com	
Michael Dadjou Pinnacle One	4199 Campus Drive Suite 650 Irvine, CA 92612	949-854-5237 mdadjou@pinnacleone.com	
Mark Juergensen Sterling Energy	26893 Calle Hermosa Capistrano Beach, CA 92624	949-248-2917 markj@sterling-energy.com	
Tom Murphy Aspen Environmental Group	8801 Folsom Blvd. #290 Sacramento, CA 95826	916-379-0350 tmurphy@aspeneg.com	
Sam Silverman Environmental Science Associates	707 Wilshire Blvd Suite 1450 Los Angeles, CA 90017	310-599-4300 ssilverman@esassoc.com	

Gixe Kamali **Kamali & Associates, Inc.**	**3142 Pacific Coast Highway** **#207A** **Torrance, CA 90505**	**310-325-7878** **kamali@ix.netcom.com**	
Matt Paryami **Paryami Associates**	**2109 Rusty Spur Road** **Diamond Bar, CA 91765**	**909-861-1810** **mgparyani@yahoo.com**	
Michael Rogozen **Ultrasystems**	**100 Pacifica Suite 250** **Irvine, CA 92618**	**949-788-4900 x238** **mrogozen@ultrasystems.com**	**SB**
Christopher Pioli **Jacobs Consultancy**	**1111 South Arroyo Parkway** **Pasadena, CA 91105**	**847-778-5755** **christopher.pioli@jacobs.com**	
Richard Gorman **Ultrasystems**	**100 Pacifica Suite 250** **Irvine, CA 92618**	**949-788-4900** **rgorman@ultrasystems.com**	**SB**
Tania Gonzalez **Earth Consultants Int.**	**150 El Camino Real #212** **Tustin, CA 92780**	**714-412-2654** **714-412-2653 (Eldon Gath)**	
James Harber **Mavtech Energy**	**3 Puerto Caravaca** **San Clemente, CA 92672**	**949-388-9531** **-9571**	

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION
PRE-BID CONFERENCE - Sacramento

RFQ: 700-05-701
September 21, 2005

VOLUNTARY SIGN-IN: You are not required to sign this sheet or provide any information as a condition for attending or participating in this meeting. However, if you want to receive notices of future meetings on today's topics, or be identified as a small or disabled veteran owned business, please write your name and address in the spaces below. A copy of this list is mailed with the questions and answer sets to all those who requested a copy of this RFQ.

HHPlease use black ink onlyHH

NAME AND COMPANY	PHYSICAL ADDRESS	PHONE NUMBER and E-MAIL ADDRESS	SMALL (SM) OR DISABLED VETERAN OWNED (DVBE) BUSINESS
Odell McWane McWane & Associates	1870 West Ashlan Avenue Fresno, CA 93705	559-230-1442 Omcwane@materialsite.com	SB
Bob Ewing SDV-SCC	205 De Anza Blvd Suite 26 San Mateo, CA 94402	650-358-9522 bewing@attglobal.net	SB/DVBE
Eric Quintero IEC Corporation	8795 Folsom Blvd Suite 205 Sacramento, CA 95826	916-383-6000 equintero@iec-corporation.com	SB
Tracy Grishau IEC Corporation	8795 Folsom Blvd Suite 205 Sacramento, CA 95826	916-383-6000 tgrishau@iec-corporation.com	SB
Christopher Pioli Jacobs Consultancy	1111 South Arroyo Parkway Pasadena, CA 91105	847-778-5755 Christopher.pioli@jacobs.com	

Hamid Rastegar **Aspen Environmental Group**	**30423 Canwood Street #215** **Agoura, CA 91301**	**818-597-3407** **hrastegar@aspeneg.com**	
Scott Olsen **Nexant**	**101 Second Street 11th Floor** **San Francisco, CA 94105**	**415-369-1034** **solsen@nexant.com**	
Tom Murphy **Aspen Environmental Group**	**8801 Folsom Blvd #290** **Sacramento, CA 95826**	**916-379-0350** **tmurphy@aspeneg.com**	
Matt Harris **New Energy Associates**	**108 Hesketh Court** **Roseville, CA 95747**	**916-772-4984** **mharris@newenergyassoc.com**	
Gary Brugger **Exponent**	**15375 SE 30th Place** **Bellevue, WA 98056**	**425-519-8712** **bruggerg@exponent.com**	
Jonathan Jacobs **PA Consulting**	**390 Interlocken Crescent** **Broomfield, CO 80021**	**510-654-9495** **Jon.jacobs@paconsulting.com**	
Paul Miller **ESA**	**8950 Cal Center Dr. Suite 300** **Sacramento, CA 95826**	**916-354-1940** **pmiller@esassoc.com**	
Suzzane Phinney **Aspen Environmental Group**	**8801 Folsom Blvd. #290** **Sacramento, CA 95826**	**916-379-0350** **sphinney@aspeneg.com**	

RFQ 700-05-701
List of Firms Requesting Copies

Kevin Wedman
Berryman Henigar Inc.
3050 Beacon Blvd. #103
West Sacramento, CA 95691

Andrew Meiman, Sr. Associate
Booz Allen Hamilton
101 California Street #3300
San Francisco, CA 94111

Jonathan Jacobs
PA Consulting Group
390 Interlocken Crescent #410
Broomfield, CO 80021

Odell McWane, President
McWane & Associates
1870 W. Ashlan Avenue #116
Fresno, CA 93705

Derrel W. Triplett

Armond Muscat
Armond & Associates
P. O. Box 251
Algonquin Illinois 60102

Mr. David W. Smith
Technology & Market Solutions
7904 Hollington Place
Fairfax Station VA 22039-3161

IPA Energy Consulting

Peter Conley
Analytic Group
2361 Campus Drive
Irvine, CA 92612

Dominique Roddler
Marine Innovation & Technology
2610 Marin Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94708

Anthony De Venuta President
Cyberspace Technologies
1007 Oak Hill Road Suite E
P.O. Box 805
Lafayette, CA 94549-0805

Jan Pepper
Enertron Consultants/Clean Power
418 Benvenue Avenue
Los Altos, CA 94024

Robert Penny Enterprise DVBE
8181 Folsom Blvd. #135
Sacramento, CA 95826

Mark Lorentzen

Jerry Dempsey, Director of Sales
OATI
2300 Berkshire Lane North
Minneapolis, MN 55441

Marketing Coordinator
HGP Inc.
8 Pelham Road
Greenville, South Carolina 29615-2142

Theresa Sanders, Director
Tyr Energy
335 Madison Avenue 22nd Floor
New York NY 10017

Lori Staucet Sharp
Marketing Coordinator
GDS Associates Inc.
1850 Parkway Place #800
Marietta, GA 30067

Val R. Jensen, Sr. Vice President
ICF Consulting
60 Broadway
San Francisco, CA 94111

Kent A. Larsen President
Power Partners International Inc.

HWL
4880 San Juan Avenue
Fair Oaks, CA 95628

Lloyd Rowe
Electric Power Group
201 South Lake Ave. #400
Pasadena, CA 91101

Stephen M. Roe, Director
EH Pechan & Associates Inc.
P.O. Box 1345
6245 Pleasant Valley Road
El Dorado, CA 95682

Robert Dickerman
KPMG, LLP
13691 Paseo de la Huerta
Poway, CA 92064

Mr. Fred Diffels, Chief Ex. Officer
HGP Inc.
P.O. Box 18540 #127
Reno, Nevada 89511

Mr. Tom Murphy
Aspen Environmental Group
8801 Folsom Blvd. #290
Sacramento, CA 95826

RFQ 700-05-701
List of Firms Requesting Copies

Dr. Hamid Rastegar
Aspen Environmental Group
30423 Canwood Street Suite 215
Agoura Hills, CA 91301

Gary Stefansky
Hatch Consulting

Laura J. Lafler, Principal
LSA Associates, Inc.
157 Park Place
Pt. Richmond, CA 94801

Victoria A. Evans, Manager
Tetra Tech EM Inc.
135 Main Street Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94105

David J. McMillan, PE
SC Energy Services
P.O. Box 3151
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403

Anupama Pandey
Nexant Inc.
101 2nd Street 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94404

Pacific Energy Sytems Inc.
1800 SW First Avenue #515
Portland, Oregon 97201

Stephen Conant
Energy Security Analysis Inc.
301 Edgewater Place #220
Wakefield, MA 01880

Betsy Lindsay, President
Ultra Systems Environmental
Laguna Pacific Companies
100 Pacifica Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618

Ramon Nadira, Vice President
TRC Global Mgmt. Solutions
1500 City West Blvd. #1000
Houston, Texas 77042

Phil Giudice, Managing Director
EnerNOC Inc.
Two Faneuil Hall 3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02109

Lupe Garcia
Electric Power Group
201 S. Lake Avenue #400
Pasadena, CA 91101

Jim Letzelter
Partner Webb, Scott & Quinn Inc
3297 W. 102nd Circle
Westminster, Colorado 80031

Bala Ramachandran
Infostep Inc.
4633 Old Ironsides Sutie 326
Santa Clara, CA 95954

Ms. April Banerjee
EMCOR Energy & Technologies
505 Sansome Street Suite 1600
San Francisco, CA 94111

Alturdyne Inc
660 Steele Street
El Cajon, CA 92020

Frederick A. Tornatore
TSS Consultants
2724 Kilgore Road
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Dan Mooy
2379 Gateway Oaks Drive #200
Sacramento, CA 95833

Joseph Hower
ENVIRON International Corp.
707 Wilshire Blv.d #4950
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ruxandra Vidu, Director
All Best Materials LLC
Nanotechnology Applied
7131 Raintree Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95621

Richard D. Williams, Manager
Devine Tarbell & Associates Inc.
2720 Gateway Oaks Drive #300
Sacramento, CA 95833

Kathleen Kelly, Vice President
Stone & Webster Mgmt.
One Main Street, Suite 900
Cambridge, MA 02142-1517

Linda Davis
P.O. Box 2821
Fair Oaks, CA 9562

Mary Forest
Exponent
149 Commonwealth Drive
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Ken Moriarty
Stanley Consultants
9200 E. Mineral Ave. #400
Englewood, CO 80112

Sonia Savage
AEC Leads
9335 Columbine Avenue
California City, CA 93505

Steven Siegel
Kleinfelder Inc.
4875 Longley Land #100
Reno, Nevada 89502

RFQ 700-05-701
List of Firms Requesting Copies

Nick Burton
Business Development Group Mgr.
633 West 5th Street
28th Floor, Suite 2803
Los Angeles, CA 90071

R.W. Beck Inc
1801 California Street Suite 2800
Denver, CO 80202

Steve Bowman
Geotechnical Manager
Terracon Consultants
1360 Greg Street #11-112
Sparks, Nevada 89431

Maria Marzieki, Vice President
Southern CA Business Manager
David Evans & Associates
800 North Haven Ave. #300
Ontario, CA 91764

Kenneth Davis
Lockwood King Marshall & Assoc.
31513 Hipshot
Castaic, CA 91384

Dave Millar
EMI
135 Main Street #1800
San Francisco, CA 94109

Bruce Hamilton, President
ADICA Consulting LLC
2021 Midwest Road #200
Oak Brook, Illinois 60523

BASE Energy Inc.
5 Third Street Suite 530
San Francisco, CA 94103

Suzanna Rosenburg
Econergy International Corp.
1925 K Street NW #230
Washington, DC 20006

Steve Done, Principal
ARUP
2440 S. Sepulveda Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Anya van Leeuwen
Aspen
30423 Canwood Street #215
Augora Hills, CA 91301

Laurie L. Byers
2rw Consultants Inc.
100 10th Street NE #202
Charlottesville, VA 22902

JR Riley
Business Development
731 Pilot Road. #H
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

Keith D. Thomsen
BioContractors Inc.
20136 State Road
Cerritos, CA 90703

John Ruby
Nexant
101 Second Street 11th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105

Past and Potential Future
CEC Staff Energy Planning Analysis Topics

Electricity Supply

The 2005 IEPR planning activities using contractors involved:

1. Electricity system simulations

2. Solving modeling problems

3. Supply Adequacy model enhancement

4. Data management

5. Retail price forecast methodologies

6. Power flow and reliability analysis associated with retirements

7. Aging Power Plant Report, nuclear workshop, and policy workshop coordination

8. Procurement-related input to the statewide and western report

9. Cost-of-generation model enhancements, comparisons and updates

10. London Economics contribution for data confidentiality appeals

Similar analytical tasks and an expanded scope of new issues that may require contractor support to address in the next IEPR cycle include the following:

1. Locational marginal pricing modeling for transmission studies

2. Develop better understanding of the resource mix of imported electricity

3. Expanded data collection and management

4. Market structure analysis (capacity markets)

5. Least-cost best-fit issues analysis (multi-year undertaking to develop standardized transparent, up-front resource selection criteria that IOUs are to employ in actual Requests for Offers and that reflect the "state's energy policy objectives" as well as the "IOUs interests")

6. Risk analysis implications for procurement (Value at Risk analysis)

7. Procurement process participation (large open topic)
8. Global Climate Change analytical support (cap-and-trade)

9. Confidentiality matters (determination of market sensitivity of data)

10. Develop Load Serving Entity/Statewide resource plans and implications (cost, environmental, reliability)

11. Staff training (increase staff knowledge, skills, and expanded modeling capability)

Natural Gas Supply

The following activities were conducted in the 2005 IEPR cycle with contractor support and may continue in the next IEPR cycle:

1. NG Market Modeling: conduct modeling of the world, US, and California natural gas markets, forecasting the long term trends in demand, supply, price, and infrastructure needs

2. NG Market Assessment: provide detailed assessments of California's natural gas markets and their policy implications

3. LNG Market Assessments: conduct assessments of the world and Pacific basin LNG markets as a foundation to understanding these potential natural gas supply sources for California

4. LNG Infrastructure Assessments: conduct research into potential issues involving LNG import terminals being proposed for California and support the Commission staff's activities in interagency working groups

Environmental Trends Analysis

The 2005 IEPR planning activities using contractor support involved the following:

1. Analysis of the electricity supply implications of the re-licensing of hydroelectric facilities by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

2. Analysis of the environmental performance trends of out-of-state power plants

3. A survey of the once-through cooling issues associated with coastal power plants

4. Analysis of environmental performance trends of in-state power plants

5. Effects of climate change on hydroelectric generation

6. Environmental data gathering, management and analysis

Similar analytical support may be required in the next IEPR cycle.

Transmission System Planning Activities

The 2005 IEPR transmission system planning activities using contractor support included the following:

1. Developing methods to quantify strategic benefits of transmission lines.

2. Developing methods to assess non-wires alternatives to transmission.

3. Assessing ongoing transmission congestion areas.

4. Identifying renewable resource grid integration issues/solutions.

5. Assessing specific transmission projects' costs and benefits.

The above transmission system planning activities will continue during the next IEPR cycle. In addition, the staff may need contractor support on identifying strategies for interconnection of renewable and non-renewable resources in the eastern WECC and Mexico.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION - ENERGY FACILITY STATUS

Updated: 9/22/2005

COLOR KEY:

- Operational / On Line
- Approved
- In Review
- On-line date is expected to be delayed beyond the date shown.
- Expected and disclosed
- Planned but undisclosed
- On hold, suspended, cancelled or approval expired. According to developers, the new on-line date will be determined when the markets are favorable and financing is available.

	Projects On Line (Arranged By Date On Line)	**Docket Number**	**Status**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Construction Completed (percent)**	**Location**	**Date Approved**	**Construction Start Date**	**Original On-line Date**	**Current or Actual On-line Date***
1a	Sunrise - Texaco & Edison Mission E.	98-AFC-4	Operational	320	100	Kern Co.	12/06/00	12/07/00	7/01	6/27/01
2	Sutter - Calpine	97-AFC-2	Operational	540	100	Sutter Co.	04/14/99	07/01/99	7/01	7/2/01
3	Los Medanos (Pittsburg) - Calpine	98-AFC-1	Operational	555	100	Contra Costa	08/17/99	09/17/99	7/01	7/9/01
4	Wildflower Larkspur - Intergen	*01-EP-1*	*Operational*	*90*	*100*	*San Diego Co.*	*04/04/01*	*04/05/01*	*7/01*	*7/16/01*
5	Wildflower Indigo 1,2&3 - Intergen	*01-EP-2*	*Operational*	*135*	*100*	*Riverside Co.*	*04/04/01*	*04/05/01*	*7/01-9/01*	*7/26-9/10/01*
6	Drews - Alliance	*01-EP-5*	*Operational*	*40*	*100*	*San Bernardino*	*04/25/01*	*04/26/01*	*9/01*	*8/15/01*
7	Hanford - GWF	*01-EP-7*	*Operational*	*95*	*100*	*Kings Co.*	*05/10/01*	*05/11/01*	*9/01*	*9/01/01*
8	Century - Alliance	*01-EP-4*	*Operational*	*40*	*100*	*San Bernardino*	*04/25/01*	*04/26/01*	*9/01*	*9/15/01*
9	Escondido - Calpeak	*01-EP-10*	*Operational*	*49.5*	*100*	*San Diego Co.*	*06/06/01*	*06/07/01*	*9/01*	*9/30/01*
10	Border - Calpeak	*01-EP-14*	*Operational*	*49.5*	*100*	*San Diego Co.*	*07/11/01*	*07/12/01*	*9/01*	*10/26/01*
11a	Gilroy I, Units 1&2 - Calpine	*01-EP-8*	*Operational*	*90*	*100*	*Santa Clara Co.*	*05/21/01*	*05/22/01*	*9/01*	*12/14/01*
			Subtotal On Line 2001	*2,004*						
11b	Gilroy I, Unit 3 - Calpine	*01-EP-8*	*Operational*	*45*	*100*	*Santa Clara Co.*	*05/21/01*	*05/22/01*	*9/01*	*2/13/02*
12	King City - Calpine	*01-EP-6*	*Operational*	*50*	*100*	*Monterey Co.*	*05/02/01*	*05/03/01*	*9/01*	*1/14/02*
13	Delta - Calpine	98-AFC-3	Operational	887	100	Contra Costa	02/09/00	04/01/00	7/02	5/10/02
14	Henrietta Peaker - GWF	01-AFC-18	Operational	96	100	Kings Co.	03/07/02	03/08/02	6/02	7/1/02
15	Moss Landing Unit 1 & 2 - Duke	99-AFC-4	Operational	1,060	100	Monterey Co.	10/25/00	11/28/00	6/02	7/11/02
16a	Huntington Beach Unit 3 - AES	00-AFC-13	Operational	225	100	Orange Co.	05/10/01	05/31/01	11/01	7/31/02
17a	Valero Cogen. Unit 1	01-AFC-5	Operational	51	100	Solano Co.	10/31/01	11/05/01	6/02	10/18/02
			Subtotal On Line 2002	*2,414*						
18	La Paloma - PG&E Natl. Units 1, 2, 3 & 4	98-AFC-2	Operational	1,124	100	Kern Co.	10/06/99	01/01/00	3/02	1/10-3/7/03
19	Los Esteros-Calpine Units 1, 2, 3 & 4	01-AFC-12	Operational	180	100	Santa Clara Co.	7/2/2002 Recertified 3/16/2005	07/08/02	5/03	3/7/03
20	High Desert - Constellation	97-AFC-1	Operational	830	100	San Bernardino	05/03/00	05/01/01	7/03	4/22/03
21	Tracy Peaker - GWF	01-AFC-16	Operational	169	100	San Joaquin Co.	07/17/02	07/22/02	4/03	6/1/03
1b	Sunrise Comb. Cycle - Texaco & Mission (amendment to application: 98-AFC-4)	98-AFC-4C	Operational	265	100	Kern Co.	11/19/01	12/21/01	6/03	6/1/03
22	Woodland II Combined Cycle - Modesto Irrigation District	01-SPPE-1	Operational	80	100	Stanislaus Co	09/19/01	02/21/02	5/03	6/6/03
23	Blythe - Caithness & FPL	99-AFC-8	Operational	520	100	Riverside Co.	03/21/01	04/27/01	4/03	7/15/03
24	Elk Hills - Sempra & Oxy	99-AFC-1	Operational	500	100	Kern Co.	12/06/00	06/08/01	12/02	7/24/03
16b	Huntington Beach Unit 4 - AES	00-AFC-13	Operational	225	100	Orange Co.	05/10/01	05/31/01	11/01	8/7/03
			Subtotal On Line 2003	*3,893*						
			Subtotal On Line 2004	*0*						
25	Donald Von Raesfeld Power Plant - (Pico) Silicon Valley Power	02-AFC-3	Operational	147	100	Santa Clara Co.	9/9/03	9/10/03	12/04	3/24/05
26a	Pastoria Phase 1 - Calpine	99-AFC-7	Operational	250	100	Kern Co.	12/20/00	10/3/01	1/03	5/4/05
27	Metcalf - Calpine	99-AFC-3	Operational	600	100	Santa Clara Co.	9/24/01	1/15/02	7/03	5/27/05
26b	Pastoria Phase 2 - Calpine	99-AFC-7	Operational	500	100	Kern Co.	12/20/00	10/3/01	1/03	7/5/05
27	**Magnolia - SoCal Power Authority**	**01-AFC-6**	**Operational**	**328**	**98**	**Los Angeles Co.**	**3/5/03**	**7/21/03**	**5/05**	**9/19/05**
			Subtotal On Line 2004	**1,825**						
			ON-LINE TOTAL	**10,136**						

	Approved / Under Construction (Arranged By On-Line Date)	**Docket Number**	**Status**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Construction Completed (percent)**	**Location**	**Date Approved**	**Construction Start Date**	**Original On-line Date**	**Current On-line Date***
1	Kings River Conservation Dist. Peaker	03-SPPE-2	Construction	97	99	Fresno Co.	5/19/04	11/04	5/05	**9/14/05**
3	Malburg-City of Vernon Combined Cycle	01-AFC-25	Construction	134	**99**	Los Angeles Co.	5/20/03	9/11/03	11/05	9/30/05
4	Walnut Energy Center - Turlock Irrigation District	02-AFC-4	Construction	250	**84**	Stanislaus Co	2/18/04	3/15/04	4/06	11/29/05
5a	Mountainview Unit 3 - SCE	00-AFC-2	Construction	528	**88**	San Bernardino	3/21/01	9/1/01, res. 3/15/04	6/03	12/15/05
6a	Riverside Energy Resource Center - City of Riverside Phase 1	04-SPPE-1	Construction	48	**19**	Riverside Co.	12/15/04	2/05	6/05	**2/10/06**
5b	Mountainview Unit 4 - SCE	00-AFC-2	Construction	528	**88**	San Bernardino	3/21/01	9/1/01, res. 3/15/04	6/03	**2/15/06**
6b	Riverside Energy Resource Center - City of Riverside Phase 2	04-SPPE-1	Construction	48	**21**	Riverside Co.	12/15/04	2/05	6/05	**2/20/06**
7	Palomar Escondido - Sempra	01-AFC-24	Construction	546	**74**	San Diego Co.	8/6/03	6/1/04	3/06	3/06
8	Ripon Simple Cycle - MID	03-SPPE-1	Construction	95	**50**	San Joaquin Co.	2/4/04	10/4/04	4/05	3/06
9	SMUD Combined Cycle Phase 1	01-AFC-19	Construction	500	**92**	Sacramento Co.	9/9/03	10/31/03	6/05	4/06
10	Roseville Combined Cycle - Roseville	03-AFC-1	**Construction**	160	**1**	Placer Co.	4/13/05	**8/18/05**	12/07	12/07
11	Otay Mesa - Calpine	99-AFC-5	Construction	590	9	San Diego Co.	4/18/01	9/10/01, res. 6/21/04	7/03	1/08
12	Salton Sea Geothermal {3}	02-AFC-2	Preconstruction	215	0	Imperial Co.	12/17/03	**2/15/06**	1/06	**2/08**
13	Inland Empire - Calpine {4}	01-AFC-17	**Construction**	800	**1**	Riverside Co.	12/17/03	**8/26/05**	12/05	6/08
			Under Construction Subtotal	*4,539*						

	Approved / Not Under Construction (Arranged By On-Line Date)	**Docket Number**	**Status**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Construction Completed (percent)**	**Location**	**Date Approved**	**Construction Start Date**	**Original On-line Date**	**Current On-line Date***
17b	Valero Cogen. Unit 2	01-AFC-5	Const. On Hold	51	37	Solano Co.	10/31/01	On Hold	12/02	Const. on hold
1	Western Midway-Sunset - Mission	99-AFC-9	On Hold	500	0	Kern Co.	3/21/01	On Hold	7/03	On Hold
2	Contra Costa - Mirant	00-AFC-1	Const. On Hold	530	7	Contra Costa	5/30/01	8/30/01	8/03	Const. on hold
3	Three Mountain - Covanta	99-AFC-2	On Hold	500	0	Shasta Co.	5/16/01	On Hold	12/03	On Hold
4	Russell City - Calpine	01-AFC-7	On Hold	600	0	Alameda Co.	9/11/02	On Hold	12/04	On Hold
5	East Altamont - Calpine	01-AFC-4	On Hold	1,100	0	Alameda Co.	8/20/03	On Hold	7/05	On Hold
6	San Joaquin Valley Energy Center - Calpine	01-AFC-22	On Hold	1,087	0	Fresno Co.	1/14/04	On Hold	1/06	On Hold
7	Morro Bay - Duke {1}	00-AFC-12	On Hold	1,200	0	S. Luis Obispo	8/2/04	On Hold	On Hold	On Hold
8	Tesla Combined Cycle - FPL	01-AFC-21	On Hold	1,120	0	Alameda Co.	6/16/04	On Hold	On Hold	On Hold
9	El Segundo Repower-Dynegy/NRG	00-AFC-14	On Hold	630	0	Los Angeles Co.	12/23/04	On Hold	On Hold	On Hold
10	United Golden Gate Phase 1 - El Paso	00-AFC-5	Approval Expired	51	0	San Mateo Co.	3/7/01	On Hold	7/01	Approval Expired
11	*Pegasus Energy - Delta Power*	*01-EP-9*	cancelled	*181*	*0*	*San Bernardino*	*6/6/01*	*cancelled*	*cancelled*	*cancelled*
12	*Chula Vista 2 - Ramco*	*01-EP-3*	cancelled	*62*	*0*	*San Diego Co.*	*6/13/01*	*cancelled*	*cancelled*	*cancelled*
13	Hanford Energy Park - GWF {2}	00-SPPE-1	cancelled	99	0	Kings Co.	4/11/01	cancelled	cancelled	cancelled
			Not Under Construction Subtotal	*7,711*						
			Approved Total	**22,386**						

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION - ENERGY FACILITY STATUS

	Projects in Review (Arranged By Estimated Decision Date)	**Docket Number**	**Process**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Project Type**	**Location**	**Date Filed**	**Estimated Decision Date**		**Estimated On-line Date****
1	Los Esteros Combined Cycle - Calpine	03-AFC-2	12-mo. AFC	140	Brown Field	Santa Clara Co.	12/30/03	**10/05**		unknown
2	Blythe 1 Transmission Line - Blythe Energy, LLC	99-AFC-8C	Amendment	230 kV	T-line	Riverside Co.	10/12/04	**11/05**		6/07
3	Blythe II Combined Cycle - FPL	02-AFC-1	12-mo. AFC	520	Green Field	Riverside Co.	2/19/02	11/05		unknown
4	Pastoria Simple Cycle addition-Calpine	05-AFC-1	12-mo. AFC	160	Expansion	Kern Co.	4/29/05	4/06		6/07
5	SF Reliability Project - City of SF	04-AFC-1	12-mo. AFC	145	Brown Field	San Francisco	3/18/04	4/06		6/07
6	Potrero Unit 7 - Mirant	00-AFC-4	12-mo. AFC	[540]	Expansion	San Francisco	5/31/00	Suspended to 11/14/05		Suspended
7	Avenal Combined Cycle - Duke	01-AFC-20	12-mo. AFC	[600]	Green Field	Kings Co.	10/9/01	Suspended to 5/1/06		Suspended
	Under Review Total			**965**						

	Projects Announced (Arranged By Estimated Filing Date)		**Process**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Project Type**	**Location**	**Estimated Filing Date**			
1	Grand Terrace Peaker - AES		6/12-mo. AFC	300	Expansion	San Bernardino	9/05			
2	South Bay Combined Cycle - Duke		12-mo. AFC	500	Replacement	San Diego Co.	12/05			
3	City of Vernon Combined Cycle		**6/12-mo. AFC**	800	Brown Field	Los Angeles Co.	12/05			
4	Placerita Cogen Amendment - AES		Amendment	100	Replacement	Los Angeles Co.	Unknown			
5	Alamitos Peaker - AES		**6/12-mo. AFC**	100	Expansion	Los Angeles Co.	Unknown			
6	Envirepel--green/yard waste		12-month	90	Green Field	San Diego Co.	Unknown			
7	Cosumnes Phase 2-SMUD		6-mo. AFC	500	Expansion	Sacramento Co.	Unknown			
8	**City of Victorville Hybrid (500 gas, 50 solar)**		**12-mo. AFC**	**550**	**Green Field**	**San Bernardino Co.**	**Unknown**			
9	Modoc Combined Cyle-National Power		12-mo. AFC	500	Green Field	Modoc Co.	Unknown			
10	BP Arco Watson		12-mo. AFC	96	Expansion	Los Angeles Co.	Unknown			
11	City of Palo Alto		12-mo. AFC	80	unknown	Santa Clara Co.	Unknown			
12	**City of Palmdale Combined Cycle**		**12-mo. AFC**	**500**	**Brown Field**	**San Bernardino Co.**	**Unknown**			
13	**Stirling Solar Thermal**		**12-mo. AFC**	**850**	**Green Field**	**San Bernardino Co.**	**Unknown**			
	Announced Total			**4,966**						

	Projects Planned		**Process**	**Capacity (MW)**	**Project Type**	**Location**	**Estimated Filing Date**			**Estimated On-line Date****
1	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	165	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
2	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	165	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
3	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	124	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
4	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	70	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
5	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	200	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
6	RFO Peaker N. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	360	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
7	**RFO Peaker N. CA**		**6/12-mo. AFC**	**200**	**Unknown**	**N. CA**	**Unknown**			**Unknown**
8	**RFO Peaker N. CA**		**6/12-mo. AFC**	**400**	**Unknown**	**N. CA**	**Unknown**			**Unknown**
9	RFO Peaker S. CA		6/12-mo. AFC	96	Unknown	S. CA	Unknown			Unknown
10	Municipal Combined Cycle		6/12-mo. AFC	250	Unknown	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
11	Refinery Cogen		6/12-mo. AFC	125	Brownfield	N. CA	Unknown			Unknown
	Planned Total			**2,155**						

NOTES:

Bold text in table identifies a change from the previous report.
* Estimated on-line date if construction is not delayed.
** Estimated on-line date if approved & constructed as proposed.
Projects in italics and an "EP" Docket Number are emergency peakers
Megawatts in [ ] are not included in totals.
{1} 1021 MW replaced with 1200 MW for a net increase of 179 MW
{2} Project approved but replaced by Hanford-GWF (01-EP-7).
{3} 30 MW organic rankine cycle amendment approved 5/11/05.
{4} 130 MW amendment approved 6/22/05.

DEFINITIONS:

Greenfield - undeveloped site
Brownfield - developed site
Expansion - New unit at existing power plant site, no loss of existing generation
Repower - Modification of existing equipment
Replacement - Demolition of old plant and construction of new plant
On Hold indicates the applicant has suspended work.
Suspended indicates the committee has suspended the proceeding.

WELCOME

California Energy Commission

Siting/Planning Peak Workload Contract

RFQ

Prebid Conference

Introductions

- Chris Tooker, Staff Services Manager, CEC
- Eileen Allen, Siting Program Manager, CEC
- Justin Oakley, Contract Officer, CEC

Scope of Conference

- Purpose of Prebid Conference
- Siting/Planning Peak Workload Contract
- RFQ Requirements and Process
- Questions

Purpose of Conference

- Provide overview of CEC's needs
- Discuss the purpose of this contract
- Potential usage of the contract
- Describe what CEC needs
- Describe administrative procedures
- Highlight special issues
- Describe the bid review process
- Answer questions

Overview of CEC Needs

- Siting and planning workload is variable
- CEC must respond in a timely manner
- CEC must address critical issues
- CEC needs extra capacity at times
- CEC needs specialized expertise at times

Purpose of this Contract

- Provide assistance to supplement the CEC staff's capacity and expertise

- Assistance needed in the siting area
  - Licensing
  - Compliance

Purpose of Contract

- Assistance needed in the energy planning area
  - Electricity supply and infrastructure
  - Natural gas supply and infrastructure
  - Transmission line systems
  - Energy infrastructure environmental trends

Potential Usage of Contract

- $18,636,000 ceiling over 3 years
- No guarantee of minimum work
- Funding depends upon legislative authorization
- CEC has $6,212,000 in its current budget
- Past invoicing rates: $77,000/month to $533,000/month
- We expect similar usage going forward

Specific CEC Needs

- Prime Contractor(s): Siting and/or Planning
  - Provide all services or manage a team
- Excellent support in all siting and/or planning areas
- Timely response when needed

Administrative Requirements

- STATEMENT OF QUALIFICATIONS

- VOLUME 1 - Administrative Response
- VOLUME 2 - Technical Response

Volume 1, Administrative Response

- Every Bidder Must Complete and Include the Following Forms in Volume 1.
  - Contractor Status Form – Attachment 3
  - DVBE Forms – Attachment 4
  - Contractor Certification Clauses – Attachment 5

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

Two options for Bidders:

1. Commitment to 3% participation

2. Satisfy Requirements of Good Faith Effort

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

1. Commitment to 3% participation includes:

   - Completed STD 840, including proof of DVBE certification.
   - Agreement signed by registered DVBE(s) and Contractor.
   - If Bidder is DVBE, written commitment of participation goals.

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

2. Requirements of Good Faith Effort include:

- Documented Organizational Contacts
  - Energy Commission
  - Other State Agencies
  - Federal: SBA - **http://pro-net.sba.gov**
  - DVBE Organizations

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

- Advertisements
  - Advertisements must run for at least 14 calendar days prior to SOQ deadline (10/20/05 – 11/4/05)
  - Include copies of ad and publication information on STD 840

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

- Advertisements (continued)
  - Trade Paper
    - Business orientation relating to the trade or industry
    - Is known and used by members of the trade or industry
    - Offers articles, editorials and ads aimed at the trade or industry
    - Is available within the geographic area where ad is placed and in which services are to be performed

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

- Advertisements (continued)
  - Focus Paper
    - Has an orientation relating to DVBE's
    - Known and used by members of DVBE community
    - Offers articles, editorials and business opportunity ads aimed at DVBE's
    - Is available within the geographic area where ad is placed and in which services are to be performed

Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (DVBE) Requirements

- List DVBEs considered
  - Attach solicitation sample or phone conversation
  - List and identify each DVBE that was contacted
  - State reasons for non-selection

Special Issues

- Conflict of Interest
  - Eligibility
  - Availability
  - Siting vs. Planning
- Cost Minimization
- Relationship to CEC staff
- Strong Management and Quality Control

Bid Review Process

- Bids screened for eligibility (mandatory formats)
- Eligible technical bids reviewed/scored by team
- Discussions conducted
- DVBE Compliance checked
- Notice of selection / scores developed & posted
- Cost negotiations
- Notice of Proposed Award

Key Dates

- September 22nd – Deadline for written technical questions. No administrative question deadline.
- September 30th – Q&A / Addendum Distributed (approximate)
- October 20th – DVBE publishing deadline
- November 4th, 5:00 PM – SOQ Due

Key Dates (Continued)

- November 17-18 – Discussions
- November 30 – Notice of Selection
- December 5-16 – Cost Negotiations
- January 4, 2006 – Notice of Proposed Award
- April 1, 2006 – Agreement Start Date

Q & A / Contact Information

- Questions?
- For further questions contact:

Justin Oakley

916-654-5833

joakley@energy.state.ca.us

- Participants Networking